



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,440	08/08/2001	Hideki Matsunaga	110331	9076

25944 7590 05/05/2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC  
P.O. BOX 19928  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

LY, ANH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2162

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/923,440

Applicant(s)

MATSUNAGA, HIDEKI

Examiner

Anh Ly

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 August 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is response to applicant's amendment filed on 02/22/2005.
2. Claims 1-18 are pending in this application.

### *Priority*

3. Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) prior to declaration of an interference, **a translation of the foreign application should be submitted** under 37 CFR 1.55 in reply to this action.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pub. No.: US 2001/0056421 A1 issued to Tada et al. (hereinafter Tada) in view of US Patent No. 6,189,032 issued to Susaki et al. (hereinafter Susaki).

With respect to claim 1, Tada teaches defining a retrieval condition for retrieving an object, the retrieval condition being defined based on at least one attribute of the object (when a document is registered or stored, retrieval data for document retrieval is created for each registered document. So each user or group want to retrieve the stored object or stored/registered document, he/she should have accessible or retrieval condition to that object comparing with the access control table in which information indicating accessibility of groups of users or users as the object/document retrievers for the document being registered: sections 0009-0013; abstract, and the access right information setting to the users: sections 0069 and sections 0086-0088); and

setting an access right in association with the retrieval condition (the access right information to each user associated to the document and retrieval condition: sections 0086-0088).

Tada teaches a document management system for controlling access right to a registered document via an access control table containing information indicating accessibility of groups including users as document retriever for the document being registered and the access right information to each user associated to the document and retrieval condition (sections 0086-0088). Tada does not clearly teach setting an identifier for identifying the object and performing access control for the object.

However, Susaki teaches access right to a certain operation such as reading, writing, deleting, updating or executing associating to the retrieval a document or object on the system (abstract, col. 3, lines 10-30 and lines 60-67 and col. 4, lines 1-67);

performing the access control via the access control list and identifier of object such as file or service stored in the table (see figs. 4, 5 and 6, col. 7, lines 36-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tada with the teachings of Susaki, wherein the access right associating to an identified object being setting to group or users in the system provided therein (Tada's figs. 2, 3 & 8), would incorporate the use of access control list in order for performing the access control (figs. 3-6 & col. 7, lines 36-65). The motivation being to protect the stored document by performing access control matching the retrieval condition.

With respect to claim 2, Tada teaches a method for performing access control for a stored object as discussed in claim 1.

Tada teaches a document management system for controlling access right to a registered document via an access control table containing information indicating accessibility of groups including users as document retriever for the document being registered and the access right information to each user associated to the document and retrieval condition (sections 0086-0088). Tada does not clearly teach performing a check, when a request for access to an object occurs, to see whether the object meets the retrieval condition, and controlling access to the access-requested object on the basis of the access right that has been set in association with the retrieval condition.

However, Susaki teaches access right to a certain operation such as reading, writing, deleting, updating or executing and performing the access control via the

Art Unit: 2162

access control list and identifier of object such as file or service stored in the table (see figs. 4, 5 and 6, col. 7, lines 36-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tada with the teachings of Susaki, wherein the access right associating to an identified object being setting to group or users in the system provided therein (Tada's figs. 2, 3 & 8), would incorporate the use of access control list in order for performing the access control (figs. 3-6 & col. 7, lines 36-65). The motivation being to protect the stored document by performing access control matching the retrieval condition.

With respect to claim 3, Tada teaches a method for performing access control for a stored object as discussed in claim 1.

Tada teaches a document management system for controlling access right to a registered document via an access control table containing information indicating accessibility of groups including users as document retriever for the document being registered and the access right information to each user associated to the document and retrieval condition (sections 0086-0088). Tada does not clearly teach performing a check, when a request for access to an object occurs, to see whether the identifier of the object has been set in association with the retrieval condition, and controlling access to the access-requested object on the basis of the access right that has been set in association with the retrieval condition if a result of the check indicates that the identifier of the access-requested object has been set in association with the retrieval condition.

However, Susaki teaches access right to a certain operation such as reading, writing, deleting, updating or executing and performing the access control via the access control list and identifier of object such as file or service stored in the table (see figs. 4, 5 and 6, col. 7, lines 36-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tada with the teachings of Susaki, wherein the access right associating to an identified object being setting to group or users in the system provided therein (Tada's figs. 2, 3 & 8), would incorporate the use of access control list in order for performing the access control (figs. 3-6 & col. 7, lines 36-65). The motivation being to protect the stored document by performing access control matching the retrieval condition.

With respect to claim 4, Tada teaches a method for performing access control for a stored object as discussed in claim 1.

Tada teaches a document management system for controlling access right to a registered document via an access control table containing information indicating accessibility of groups including users as document retriever for the document being registered and the access right information to each user associated to the document and retrieval condition (sections 0086-0088). Tada does not clearly teach wherein the association between the retrieval condition and the identifier is changed according to need when addition, modification, or deletion of the object identified by the identifier is made.

However, Susaki teaches access right to a certain operation such as reading, writing, deleting, updating or executing and performing the access control via the access control list and identifier of object such as file or service stored in the table and service identifier as object/document identifier (see figs. 4, 5 and 6, col. 7, lines 36-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tada with the teachings of Susaki, wherein the access right associating to an identified object being setting to group or users in the system provided therein (Tada's figs. 2, 3 & 8), would incorporate the use of access control list in order for performing the access control (figs. 3-6 & col. 7, lines 36-65). The motivation being to protect the stored document by performing access control matching the retrieval condition.

With respect to claim 5, Tada teaches a method for performing access control for a stored object as discussed in claim 1.

Tada teaches a document management system for controlling access right to a registered document via an access control table containing information indicating accessibility of groups including users as document retriever for the document being registered and the access right information to each user associated to the document and retrieval condition (sections 0086-0088). Tada does not clearly teach performing access control, if the access-requested object matches a plurality of retrieval conditions, on the basis of OR of the matched retrieval conditions.

However, Susaki teaches access right to a certain operation such as reading, writing, deleting, updating or executing and performing the access control via the



Art Unit: 2162

access control list and identifier of object such as file or service stored in the table and service identifier as object/document identifier (see figs. 4, 5 and 6, col. 7, lines 36-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tada with the teachings of Susaki, wherein the access right associating to an identified object being setting to group or users in the system provided therein (Tada's figs. 2, 3 & 8), would incorporate the use of access control list in order for performing the access control (figs. 3-6 & col. 7, lines 36-65). The motivation being to protect the stored document by performing access control matching the retrieval condition.

With respect to claim 6, Tada teaches a method for performing access control for a stored object as discussed in claim 1.

Tada teaches a document management system for controlling access right to a registered document via an access control table containing information indicating accessibility of groups including users as document retriever for the document being registered and the access right information to each user associated to the document and retrieval condition (sections 0086-0088). Tada does not clearly teach performing access control, if the access-requested object matches a plurality of retrieval conditions, on the basis of AND of the matched retrieval conditions.

However, Susaki teaches access right to a certain operation such as reading, writing, deleting, updating or executing and performing the access control via the access control list and identifier of object such as file or service stored in the table and service identifier as object/document identifier (see figs. 4, 5 and 6, col. 7, lines 36-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tada with the teachings of Susaki, wherein the access right associating to an identified object being setting to group or users in the system provided therein (Tada's figs. 2, 3 & 8), would incorporate the use of access control list in order for performing the access control (figs. 3-6 & col. 7, lines 36-65). The motivation being to protect the stored document by performing access control matching the retrieval condition.

With respect to claim 7, Tada teaches wherein the object is stored with attribute data, and the retrieval condition aims to retrieve the object on the basis of the attribute data (attribute information of all documents: sections 0012-0013).

With respect to claim 8, Tada teaches wherein the object is stored with attribute data and a method for referring to an entity of the object, and the retrieval condition aims to retrieve the object on the basis of the attribute data and the entity of the object referred to by the method (sections 0012-0013).

With respect to claim 9, Tada teaches wherein the access right is a specification about a user and an access type allowed to access the object (access right information such as reading, writing or executing to be set to the user; sections 0069 and 0086-0088).

Claim 10 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 11 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 2 hereinabove.

Claim 12 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3 hereinabove.

Claim 13 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.

Claim 14 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

Claim 15 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 6 hereinabove.

Claim 16 is essentially the same as claim 7 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 7 hereinabove.

Claim 17 is essentially the same as claim 8 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 8 hereinabove.

Art Unit: 2162

Claim 18 is essentially the same as claim 9 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 9 hereinabove.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2162

### Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV or fax to (571) 273-4039. The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (571) 272-4107 or Primary Examiner Jean Corrielus (571) 272-4032.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: Central Fax Center (703) 872-9306

ANH LY   
APR. 29<sup>th</sup>, 2005

  
JEAN M. CORRIELUS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER